arXiv:1008.0914v3 [hep-ph] 16 Sep 2010

Cancellation Mechanism of FCNCs in $S_4 \times Z_2$ Flavor Symmetric Extra U(1) Model

Y. Daikoku* and H. Okada†
*Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kanazawa University, Kanazawa 920-1192, Japan.**
Centre for Theoretical Physics, The British University in Egypt†

September 17, 2010

Abstract

We propose a E_6 inspired supersymmetric model with a non-Abelian discrete flavor symmetry; $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_W \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)_X \times S_4 \times Z_2$. In our scenario, the additional abelian gauge symmetry; $U(1)_X$, not only solves the μ-problem in the minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model(MSSM), but also requires new exotic fields which play an important role in solving flavor puzzles. If our exotic quarks can be embedded into a S_4 triplet, which corresponds to the number of the generation, one finds that dangerous proton decay can be well-suppressed. Hence, it might be expected that the generation structure for lepton and quark in the SM(Standard Model) can be understood as a new system in order to stabilize the proton in a supersymemtric standard model (SUSY). Moreover, due to the nature of the discrete non-Abelian symmetry itself, Yukawa coupling constants of our model are drastically reduced.

In our previous work, we actually have found much success. However, we also have to solve Higgs mediated FCNC at tree level, as is often the case with such extended Higgs models. In this paper, we propose a promising mechanism which could make cancellation between Higgs and SUSY contributions.

---

*E-mail: yasu_daikoku@yahoo.co.jp
†E-mail: HOkada@bue.edu.eg

1 Introduction

It is well-known that the standard model based on $G_{SM} = SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_W \times U(1)_Y$ gauge symmetry is a quite promising theory to describe interactions of the particles.

However, there are unsolved or non-verifiable points enough, in particular, the followings are underlying to be clarified:

1. The electroweak symmetry breaking scale $M_W \sim 10^2$ GeV is unnaturally small in comparison with the fundamental energy scale such as Planck scale $M_P \sim 10^{18}$ GeV.
2. The number of Yukawa coupling constants is too many to give predictions of the quark and lepton mass matrices.
3. There is no understanding about the meaning of generations.

It is believed that the first point is solved by introducing SUSY [1], but there is still naturalness problem in the MSSM. The superpotential of MSSM has μ-term:

$$\mu H^U H^D. \tag{1}$$

The parameter μ has to be fine-tuned to $O(1 \text{ TeV})$ in order to give appropriate electroweak breaking scale, but it is unnatural. This problem is elegantly solved by introducing an additional U(1) gauge symmetry. This extra U(1) model is proposed in the context of superstring-inspired E_6 model [2]. In this model, the bare μ-term is forbidden by the new $U(1)_X$ symmetry, but the trilinear term including G_{SM} singlet superfield S is allowed:

$$\lambda S H^U H^D. \tag{2}$$

When this singlet field S develops a vacuum expectation value (VEV), the $U(1)_X$ gauge symmetry is spontaneously broken and an effective μ-term; $\mu_{\text{eff}} H^U H^D$, is generated from this term, where $\mu_{\text{eff}} = \lambda \langle S \rangle$ [3].

A promising solution for the second point is a flavor symmetry [1]. In fact, the flavor symmetry strongly reduces the Yukawa coupling constants. Here, we introduce a non-Abelian discrete flavor symmetry involved in triplet representations, expecting that the number of the generations for lepton and quark is *three*. The triplet representations are contained in several non-Abelian discrete symmetry groups [5], for examples, S_4 [6], A_4 [7], T' [8], $\Delta(27)$ [9] and $\Delta(54)$ [10]. In our work, we consider $S_4 \times Z_2$.

A promising solution for the third point can be arose by the cooperation with the flavor symmetry and supersymmetry. In the MSSM, the R-parity conserving operators such as $QQQL, E^c U^c U^c D^c$ induce the proton decay at unacceptable level. But, in the extra U(1) model, these operators are forbidden by the additional gauge symmetry. However, since the extra U(1) model has additional exotic fields, the Yukawa interactions for the exotic quarks and leptons and quarks reduce proton life time to unacceptable level, again. With the S_4 flavor symmetry, such a dangerous proton decay is sufficiently suppressed. Hence, it might be expected that the generation structure can be understood as a new system in order to stabilize the proton [11].

Considering the Higgs sector of our model, there is a serious problem of flavor changing neutral current (FCNC). Multiple Higgs interactions with leptons and quarks induce too large FCNC, if the mass scale of Higgs bosons is at $O(TeV)$ region [12]. In this paper, we show Higgs contributions to FCNC may be cancelled by SUSY FCNC contributions. This cancellation solution softens the FCNC constraint on Higgs mass. Because the mass bound of Higgs mass is at $O(TeV)$ region, our model is testable at LHC or future colliders.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we explain the basic structure of S_4 flavor symmetric extra U(1) model. We give the superpotential of quark and lepton sector in section 3, and of Higgs sector in section 4. In section 5, we discuss the Higgs and SUSY contributions to FCNC. Finally, we make a brief summary in section 6. Experimental values of mixing matrices and masses of quarks and leptons are given in appendix, which are used to test our models.

---

[1] The E_6 inspired supersymmetric extension of SM with discrete flavor symmetry has been considered by authors [4].

2 The Extra U(1) Model with S_4 Flavor Symmetry

2.1 The Extra U(1) Model

The basic structure of the extra U(1) model is given as follows. At high energy scale, the gauge symmetry of model has two extra U(1)s, which consists maximal subgroup of E_6 as $G_2 = G_{SM} \times U(1)_X \times U(1)_Z \subset E_6$. MSSM superfields and additional superfields are embedded in three 27 multiplets of E_6 to cancel anomalies, which is illustrated in Table 1. The 27 multiplets are decomposed as $\mathbf{27} \supset \{Q, U^c, E^c, D^c, L, N^c, H^D, g^c, H^U, g, S\}$, where N^c are right-handed neutrinos (RHN), g and g^c are exotic quarks, and S are G_{SM} singlets. We introduce $G_{SM} \times U(1)_X$ singlets Φ and Φ^c to break $U(1)_Z$ which prevents the RHNs from having Majorana mass terms. If the $G_{SM} \times U(1)_X$ singlets develop the intermediate scale VEVs along the D-flat direction of $\langle\Phi\rangle = \langle\Phi^c\rangle$, then the $U(1)_Z$ is broken and the RHNs obtain the mass terms through the trilinear terms $Y^M \Phi N^c N^c$ in the superpotential. After the symmetry is broken, as the R-parity symmetry

$$R = \exp\left[\frac{i\pi}{20}(3x - 8y + 15z)\right] \tag{3}$$

remains unbroken, $G_1 = G_{SM} \times U(1)_X \times R$ survives at low energy. This is the symmetry of the low energy extra U(1) model.

Within the renormalizable operators, the full G_2 symmetric superpotential is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
W_1 &= W_0 + W_S + W_B, & (4)\\
W_0 &= Y^U H^U Q U^c + Y^D H^D Q D^c + Y^E H^D L E^c + Y^N H^U L N^c + Y^M \Phi N^c N^c, & (5)\\
W_S &= k S g g^c + \lambda S H^U H^D, & (6)\\
W_B &= \lambda_1 Q Q g + \lambda_2 g^c U^c D^c + \lambda_3 g E^c U^c + \lambda_4 g^c L Q + \lambda_5 g D^c N^c. & (7)
\end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, we drop gauge and generation indices. Where W_0 is the same as the superpotential of the MSSM with the RHNs besides the absence of μ-term, and W_S and W_B are the new interactions. In W_S, $kSgg^c$ drives the soft SUSY breaking scalar squared mass of S to negative through the renormalization group equations (RGEs) and then breaks $U(1)_X$ and generates mass terms of exotic quarks, and $\lambda S H^U H^D$ is source of the effective μ-term. Therefore, W_0 and W_S are phenomenologically necessary. In contrast, W_B breaks baryon number and leads to very rapid proton decay, which are phenomenologically unacceptable, so this must be forbidden.

	Q	U^c	E^c	D^c	L	N^c	H^D	g^c	H^U	g	S	Φ	Φ^c
$SU(3)_c$	3	3^*	1	3^*	1	1	1	3^*	1	3	1	1	1
$SU(2)_W$	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
$y = 6Y$	1	-4	6	2	-3	0	-3	2	3	-2	0	0	0
x	1	1	1	2	2	0	-3	-3	-2	-2	5	0	0
z	-1	-1	-1	2	2	-4	-1	-1	2	2	-1	8	-8
R	$-$	$-$	$-$	$-$	$-$	$-$	$+$	$+$	$+$	$+$	$+$	$+$	$+$

Table 1: G_2 assignment of fields. Where the x, y and z are charges of $U(1)_X$, $U(1)_Y$ and $U(1)_Z$, and Y is hypercharge.

2.2 S_4 Flavor Symmetry

We show how the S_4 flavor symmetry forbids the baryon number violating superpotential W_B. Non-Abelian group S_4 has two singlet representations $\mathbf{1}$, $\mathbf{1'}$, one doublet representation $\mathbf{2}$ and two triplet representations $\mathbf{3}$, $\mathbf{3'}$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is the trivial representation. As the generation number of quarks and leptons is three, at least one superfield of $\{Q, U^c, E^c, D^c, L, N^c, H^D, g^c, H^U, g, S\}$ must be assigned to triplet of S_4 in order to solve flavor puzzle. As we assume that full E_6 symmetry does not realize at Planck scale, there is no need to assign all superfields to the same S_4 representations. The multiplication rules of these representations are as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathbf{3}\times\mathbf{3}=\mathbf{1}+\mathbf{2}+\mathbf{3}+\mathbf{3}', & \mathbf{3}'\times\mathbf{3}'=\mathbf{1}+\mathbf{2}+\mathbf{3}+\mathbf{3}', \\ \mathbf{3}\times\mathbf{3}'=\mathbf{1}'+\mathbf{2}+\mathbf{3}+\mathbf{3}', & \mathbf{2}\times\mathbf{3}=\mathbf{3}+\mathbf{3}', \\ \mathbf{2}\times\mathbf{3}'=\mathbf{3}+\mathbf{3}', & \mathbf{2}\times\mathbf{2}=\mathbf{1}+\mathbf{1}'+\mathbf{2}, \\ \mathbf{1}'\times\mathbf{3}=\mathbf{3}', & \mathbf{1}'\times\mathbf{3}'=\mathbf{3}, \\ \mathbf{1}'\times\mathbf{2}=\mathbf{2}, & \mathbf{1}'\times\mathbf{1}'=\mathbf{1}. \end{array} \tag{8}$$

With these rules, it is easily shown that all the S_4 invariants consist of two or three non-trivial representations are given by

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{1}'\cdot\mathbf{1}',\quad \mathbf{2}\cdot\mathbf{2},\quad \mathbf{3}\cdot\mathbf{3},\quad \mathbf{3}'\cdot\mathbf{3}',\quad \mathbf{1}'\cdot\mathbf{2}\cdot\mathbf{2},\quad \mathbf{1}'\cdot\mathbf{3}\cdot\mathbf{3}',\quad \mathbf{2}\cdot\mathbf{2}\cdot\mathbf{2},\quad \mathbf{2}\cdot\mathbf{3}\cdot\mathbf{3}, \\ \mathbf{2}\cdot\mathbf{3}\cdot\mathbf{3}',\quad \mathbf{2}\cdot\mathbf{3}'\cdot\mathbf{3}',\quad \mathbf{3}\cdot\mathbf{3}\cdot\mathbf{3},\quad \mathbf{3}\cdot\mathbf{3}\cdot\mathbf{3}',\quad \mathbf{3}\cdot\mathbf{3}'\cdot\mathbf{3}',\quad \mathbf{3}'\cdot\mathbf{3}'\cdot\mathbf{3}'. \end{array} \tag{9}$$

From these, one can see that there is no invariant including only one triplet [2]. Therefore, if g and g^c are assigned to triplets and the others are assigned to singlets or doublets, then W_B is forbidden. This provides a solution to the proton life time problem.

2.3 Exotic Quark Decay and Proton Decay Suppression

The absence of W_B makes exotic quarks and proton stable, but the existence of exotic quarks which have life time longer than 0.1 second spoils the success of Big Ban nucleosynthesis. In order to evade this problem, the S_4 symmetry must be broken. Therefore, it is assumed that the S_4 breaking terms are induced from non-renormalizable terms. We introduce G_2 singlet T as triplet of S_4 and add the quartic terms:

$$W_{NRB}=\frac{1}{M_P}T\left(QQg+g^cU^cD^c+gE^cU^c+g^cLQ+gD^cN^c\right). \tag{10}$$

Where the order one coefficients in front of each terms are omitted for simplicity. When T develops VEV with

$$\frac{\langle T\rangle}{M_P}\sim 10^{-12}, \tag{11}$$

the phenomenological constraints on the life times of proton and exotic quarks are satisfied at the same time [4]. The violation of S_4 symmetry gives S_4 breaking corrections to effective superpotential through the non-renormalizable terms which are expressed in the same manner as Eq.(10):

$$W_{NRFV}=\frac{1}{M_P^2}T^2\left(H^UQU^c+H^DQD^c+H^DLE^c+H^ULN^c+M'N^cN^c+SH^UH^D\right)+\frac{1}{M_P}TSgg^c. \tag{12}$$

Since the above corrections are negligibly small, the S_4 flavor symmetry approximately holds in low energy effective theory. One finds that the most economical flavon sector is the one which is exchanged T into superfield-product; $\Phi\Phi^c/M_P$, by embedding Φ^c to a S_4 triplet (Hereafter, we call Φ and Φ^c as flavon which is the trigger of flavor violation.). In this case, the condition of Eq. (11) correspond to the following relation:

$$\frac{\langle\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi^c\rangle}{M_P^2}\sim 10^{-12}, \tag{13}$$

and then the right-handed neutrino mass scale can be predicted as follows:

$$M_R\sim\langle\Phi\rangle\sim 10^{-6}M_P\sim 10^{12}\ \text{GeV}. \tag{14}$$

Hence, by applying the above relation to the measurement of proton and exotic quarks (In our model, we call exotic quarks as g-quark.) life time, it is expected that one can determine the right-handed neutrino mass scale.

3 Quark and Lepton Sector

At first, we define W_0 that contributes mass matrices of quarks and leptons. Although the S_4 symmetry reduces the Yukawa coupling constants, there is still an overabundance of parameters. In order to reduce

	Q_i	Q_3	U_i^c	U_3^c	E_1^c	E_2^c	E_3^c	D_i^c	D_3^c	L_i	L_3	N_i^c
S_4	**2**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**1**	**1**	$\mathbf{1'}$	**2**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**2**
Z_2	$+$	$-$	$-$	$+$	$+$	$-$	$+$	$-$	$+$	$+$	$+$	$+$
	N_3^c	H_i^D	H_3^D	H_i^U	H_3^U	S_i	S_3	g_a	g_a^c	Φ_i	Φ_3	Φ_a^c
S_4	**1**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**3**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**3**
Z_2	$+$	$+$	$-$	$+$	$-$	$-$	$+$	$+$	$+$	$-$	$+$	$+$

Table 2: $S_4 \times Z_2$ assignment of superfields (Where the index i of the S_4 doublets runs $i = 1, 2$, and the index a of the S_4 triplets runs $a = 1, 2, 3$.)

the Yukawa coupling constants further, we extend the flavor symmetry to $S_4 \times Z_2$ [13]. In our model, all chiral superfields are assigned to the representations of $S_4 \times Z_2$ as Table 2.

The superpotential W_0 which is consistent with G_2 and the symmetries of Table 2 is given by

$$\begin{aligned} W_0 &= Y_1^U H_3^U (Q_1 U_1^c + Q_2 U_2^c) + Y_3^U H_3^U Q_3 U_3^c \\ &+ Y_4^U Q_3 (H_1^U U_1^c + H_2^U U_2^c) + Y_5^U (H_1^U Q_1 + H_2^U Q_2) U_3^c \\ &+ Y_1^D H_3^D (Q_1 D_1^c + Q_2 D_2^c) + Y_3^D H_3^D Q_3 D_3^c \\ &+ Y_4^D Q_3 (H_1^D D_1^c + H_2^D D_2^c) + Y_5^D (H_1^D Q_1 + H_2^D Q_2) D_3^c \\ &+ Y_2^N \left[H_1^U (L_1 N_2^c + L_2 N_1^c) + H_2^U (L_1 N_1^c - L_2 N_2^c) \right] \\ &+ Y_3^N H_3^U L_3 N_3^c + Y_4^N L_3 (H_1^U N_1^c + H_2^U N_2^c) \\ &+ Y_1^E E_1^c (H_1^D L_1 + H_2^D L_2) + Y_2^E E_2^c H_3^D L_3 + Y_3^E E_3^c (H_1^D L_2 - H_2^D L_1) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} Y_1^M \Phi (N_1^c N_1^c + N_2^c N_2^c) + \frac{1}{2} Y_3^M \Phi N_3^c N_3^c. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

There are sixteen complex Yukawa coupling constants in this superpotential. The twelve phases of these can be absorbed by redefinition of the five of six quark superfields $\{Q_i, Q_3, U_i^c, U_3^c, D_i^c, D_3^c\}$ and seven lepton superfields $\{L_i, L_3, E_1^c, E_2^c, E_3^c, N_i^c, N_3^c\}$. Without loss of generality, we can define $Y_{3,4,5}^U, Y_{4,5}^D, Y_{2,4}^N, Y_{1,2,3}^E, Y_{1,3}^M$ to be real. We define the phases of complex Yukawa couplings as follows:

$$Y_1^U = e^{i\alpha} |Y_1^U|, \quad Y_1^D = e^{i\beta} |Y_1^D|, \quad Y_3^D = e^{i\gamma} |Y_3^D|, \quad Y_3^N = e^{i\delta} |Y_3^N|. \tag{16}$$

We write the VEV of the flavon as

$$\langle \Phi \rangle = V, \tag{17}$$

and the VEVs of the $SU(2)_W$ doublet Higgses as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle H_1^U \rangle &= v_u \cos\theta_u, \quad \langle H_2^U \rangle = v_u \sin\theta_u, \quad \langle H_3^U \rangle = v'_u, \\ \langle H_1^D \rangle &= v_d \cos\theta_d, \quad \langle H_2^D \rangle = v_d \sin\theta_d, \quad \langle H_3^D \rangle = v'_d, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where we assume these VEVs are real and the parameters $V, v_{u,d}, v'_{u,d}$ are non-negative and the relation

$$\sqrt{v_u^2 + v_u'^2 + v_d^2 + v_d'^2} = 174 \text{ GeV} \tag{19}$$

is satisfied. If we define the non-negative mass parameters as follows:

$$\begin{array}{llll} M_1 = Y_1^M V, & M_3 = Y_3^M V, & & \\ m_1^u = |Y_1^U| v'_u, & m_3^u = Y_3^U v'_u, & m_4^u = Y_4^U v_u, & m_5^u = Y_5^U v_u, \\ m_1^d = |Y_1^D| v'_d, & m_3^d = |Y_3^D| v'_d, & m_4^d = Y_4^D v_d, & m_5^d = Y_5^D v_d, \\ m_2^\nu = Y_2^N v_u, & m_3^\nu = |Y_3^N| v'_u, & m_4^\nu = Y_4^N v_u, & \\ m_1^l = Y_1^E v_d, & m_2^l = Y_2^E v'_d, & m_3^l = Y_3^E v_d, & \end{array} \tag{20}$$

---

[2] T' does not have this property but A_4, $\Delta(27)$ and $\Delta(54)$ have.

then the mass matrices of up-type quarks (M_u), down-type quarks (M_d), charged leptons (M_l), Dirac neutrinos (M_D) and Majorana neutrinos (M_R) are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
M_u &= \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\alpha}m_1^u & 0 & m_5^u\cos\theta_u \\ 0 & e^{i\alpha}m_1^u & m_5^u\sin\theta_u \\ m_4^u\cos\theta_u & m_4^u\sin\theta_u & m_3^u \end{pmatrix}, \quad & M_d &= \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\beta}m_1^d & 0 & m_5^d\cos\theta_d \\ 0 & e^{i\beta}m_1^d & m_5^d\sin\theta_d \\ m_4^d\cos\theta_d & m_4^d\sin\theta_d & e^{i\gamma}m_3^d \end{pmatrix}, \\
M_l &= \begin{pmatrix} m_1^l\cos\theta_d & 0 & -m_3^l\sin\theta_d \\ m_1^l\sin\theta_d & 0 & m_3^l\cos\theta_d \\ 0 & m_2^l & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad & M_D &= \begin{pmatrix} m_2^\nu\sin\theta_u & m_2^\nu\cos\theta_u & 0 \\ m_2^\nu\cos\theta_u & -m_2^\nu\sin\theta_u & 0 \\ m_4^\nu\cos\theta_u & m_4^\nu\sin\theta_u & e^{i\delta}m_3^\nu \end{pmatrix}, \\
M_R &= \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & M_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & M_3 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

After the seesaw mechanism, the light neutrino mass matrix is given by

$$M_\nu = M_D M_R^{-1} M_D^t = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_2^2 & 0 & \rho_2\rho_4\sin 2\theta_u \\ 0 & \rho_2^2 & \rho_2\rho_4\cos 2\theta_u \\ \rho_2\rho_4\sin 2\theta_u & \rho_2\rho_4\cos 2\theta_u & \rho_4^2 + e^{2i\delta}\rho_3^2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{22}$$

where

$$\rho_2 = \frac{m_2^\nu}{\sqrt{M_1}}, \quad \rho_4 = \frac{m_4^\nu}{\sqrt{M_1}}, \quad \rho_3 = \frac{m_3^\nu}{\sqrt{M_3}}. \tag{23}$$

In the lepton sector, the mass eigenvalues and diagonalization matrix of charged leptons are given by

$$V_{lR}^\dagger M_l^t V_{lL} = diag(m_e, m_\mu, m_\tau) = (m_2^l, m_3^l, m_1^l), \tag{24}$$

$$V_{lL} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\sin\theta_d & \cos\theta_d \\ 0 & \cos\theta_d & \sin\theta_d \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{25}$$

$$V_{lR} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{26}$$

and those of the light neutrinos are given by

$$V_\nu^t M_\nu V_\nu = diag(e^{i(\phi_1-\phi)}m_{\nu_1}, e^{i(\phi_2+\phi)}m_{\nu_2}, m_{\nu_3}), \tag{27}$$

$$V_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} \sin 2\theta_u & -\cos 2\theta_u & 0 \\ \cos 2\theta_u & \sin 2\theta_u & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -\sin\theta_\nu & e^{i\phi}\cos\theta_\nu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ e^{-i\phi}\cos\theta_\nu & \sin\theta_\nu & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{28}$$

from Eq.(25) and Eq.(28), the Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata (MNS) matrix is given by

$$V'_{MNS} = V_{lL}^\dagger V_\nu P_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} -e^{-i\phi}\cos\theta_\nu & -\sin\theta_\nu & 0 \\ -\cos\bar\theta\sin\theta_\nu & e^{i\phi}\cos\bar\theta\cos\theta_\nu & \sin\bar\theta \\ -\sin\bar\theta\sin\theta_\nu & e^{i\phi}\sin\bar\theta\cos\theta_\nu & -\cos\bar\theta \end{pmatrix} P_\nu, \tag{29}$$

where

$$\bar\theta = \theta_d + 2\theta_u, \tag{30}$$

$$P_\nu = diag(e^{-i(\phi_1-\phi)/2}, e^{-i(\phi_2+\phi)/2}, 1). \tag{31}$$

Following ref. [13], we get

$$\tan^2\theta_\nu = \frac{\sqrt{m_{\nu_2}^2 - m_{\nu_3}^2\sin^2\phi} - m_{\nu_3}|\cos\phi|}{\sqrt{m_{\nu_1}^2 - m_{\nu_3}^2\sin^2\phi} + m_{\nu_3}|\cos\phi|}, \tag{32}$$

$$\sin(\phi_1-\phi_2) = \frac{m_{\nu_3}\sin\phi}{m_{\nu_1}m_{\nu_2}}\left[\sqrt{m_{\nu_2}^2 - m_{\nu_3}^2\sin^2\phi} + \sqrt{m_{\nu_1}^2 - m_{\nu_3}^2\sin^2\phi}\right], \tag{33}$$

$$\sin(\phi_1-\phi) = \frac{\sin\phi}{m_{\nu_1}}\left[m_{\nu_3}\sqrt{1-\sin^2\phi} + \sqrt{m_{\nu_1}^2 - m_{\nu_3}^2\sin^2\phi}\right]. \tag{34}$$

After the redefinition of the fields, the MNS matrix is transformed to the standard form in Eq.(106) where the parameters are given by

$$\theta_{13}=0, \quad \theta_{12}=\theta_\nu, \quad \theta_{23}=\bar{\theta}, \quad \alpha'=\frac{\phi_1-\phi_2}{2}, \quad \beta'=\frac{\phi_1-\phi}{2}. \tag{35}$$

If the neutrino masses have been measured, the two Majorana phases α' and β' would be predicted by Eqs.(32), (33), (34) and (35). In addition, $\theta_{13}=0$ is predicted, so totally three predictions are given in the lepton sector.

In the quark sector, the mass eigenvalues and diagonalization matrices of quarks are given as follows:

$$V_{uR}^\dagger M_u^t V_{uL} = diag(m_u, m_c, m_t), \tag{36}$$

$$V_{uL} = V_u \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\phi_{uL}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta_{uL} & 0 & \sin\theta_{uL} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -\sin\theta_{uL} & 0 & \cos\theta_{uL} \end{pmatrix} S_{12}, \tag{37}$$

$$V_{uR} = V_u \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\phi_{uR}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta_{uR} & 0 & \sin\theta_{uR} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -\sin\theta_{uR} & 0 & \cos\theta_{uR} \end{pmatrix} S_{12}, \tag{38}$$

$$V_u = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta_u & -\sin\theta_u & 0 \\ \sin\theta_u & \cos\theta_u & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{39}$$

$$m_u^2 = (m_1^u)^2, \tag{40}$$

$$m_c^2 = \frac{1}{2}\left[(m_1^u)^2+(m_3^u)^2+(m_4^u)^2+(m_5^u)^2-\mu_u^2\right], \tag{41}$$

$$m_t^2 = \frac{1}{2}\left[(m_1^u)^2+(m_3^u)^2+(m_4^u)^2+(m_5^u)^2+\mu_u^2\right], \tag{42}$$

$$\mu_u^2 = \sqrt{\left((m_3^u)^2+(m_4^u)^2-(m_1^u)^2-(m_5^u)^2\right)^2+4L_u^2}, \tag{43}$$

$$L_u = \sqrt{(m_1^u m_4^u\cos\alpha+m_3^u m_5^u)^2+(m_1^u m_4^u\sin\alpha)^2}, \tag{44}$$

$$R_u = \sqrt{(m_1^u m_5^u\cos\alpha+m_3^u m_4^u)^2+(m_1^u m_5^u\sin\alpha)^2}, \tag{45}$$

$$\tan 2\theta_{uL} = \frac{2L_u}{(m_3^u)^2+(m_4^u)^2-(m_1^u)^2-(m_5^u)^2}, \tag{46}$$

$$\tan\phi_{uL} = \frac{m_1^u m_4^u\sin\alpha}{m_1^u m_4^u\cos\alpha+m_3^u m_5^u}, \tag{47}$$

$$\tan 2\theta_{uR} = \frac{2R_u}{(m_3^u)^2+(m_5^u)^2-(m_1^u)^2-(m_4^u)^2}, \tag{48}$$

$$\tan\phi_{uR} = \frac{-m_1^u m_5^u\sin\alpha}{m_1^u m_5^u\cos\alpha+m_3^u m_4^u}, \tag{49}$$

$$V_{dR}^\dagger M_d^t V_{dL} = diag(m_d, m_s, m_b), \tag{50}$$

$$V_{dL} = V_d \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\phi_{dL}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta_{dL} & 0 & \sin\theta_{dL} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -\sin\theta_{dL} & 0 & \cos\theta_{dL} \end{pmatrix} S_{12}, \tag{51}$$

$$V_{dR} = V_d \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\phi_{dR}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta_{dR} & 0 & \sin\theta_{dR} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -\sin\theta_{dR} & 0 & \cos\theta_{dR} \end{pmatrix} S_{12}, \tag{52}$$

$$V_d = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta_d & -\sin\theta_d & 0 \\ \sin\theta_d & \cos\theta_d & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{53}$$

$$m_d^2 = (m_1^d)^2, \tag{54}$$

$$m_s^2 = \frac{1}{2}\left[(m_1^d)^2+(m_3^d)^2+(m_4^d)^2+(m_5^d)^2-\mu_d^2\right], \tag{55}$$

$$m_b^2 = \frac{1}{2}\left[(m_1^d)^2+(m_3^d)^2+(m_4^d)^2+(m_5^d)^2+\mu_d^2\right], \tag{56}$$

$$\mu_d^2 = \sqrt{\left((m_3^d)^2+(m_4^d)^2-(m_1^d)^2-(m_5^d)^2\right)^2+4L_d^2}, \tag{57}$$

$$L_d = \sqrt{(m_1^d m_4^d\cos\beta+m_3^d m_5^d\cos\gamma)^2+(m_1^d m_4^d\sin\beta-m_3^d m_5^d\sin\gamma)^2}, \tag{58}$$

$$R_d = \sqrt{(m_1^d m_5^d\cos\beta+m_3^d m_4^d\cos\gamma)^2+(m_1^d m_5^d\sin\beta-m_3^d m_4^d\sin\gamma)^2}, \tag{59}$$

$$\tan 2\theta_{dL} = \frac{2L_d}{(m_3^d)^2+(m_4^d)^2-(m_1^d)^2-(m_5^d)^2}, \tag{60}$$

$$\tan\phi_{dL} = \frac{m_1^d m_4^d\sin\beta-m_3^d m_5^d\sin\gamma}{m_1^d m_4^d\cos\beta+m_3^d m_5^d\cos\gamma}, \tag{61}$$

$$\tan 2\theta_{dR} = \frac{2R_d}{(m_3^d)^2+(m_5^d)^2-(m_1^d)^2-(m_4^d)^2}, \tag{62}$$

$$\tan\phi_{dR} = \frac{-m_1^d m_5^d\sin\beta+m_3^d m_4^d\sin\gamma}{m_1^d m_5^d\cos\beta+m_3^d m_4^d\cos\gamma}, \tag{63}$$

$$S_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{64}$$

from which the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix is given by

$$V_{CKM} = V_{uL}^\dagger V_{dL} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\tilde\theta & -\sin\tilde\theta\cos\theta_{dL} & -\sin\tilde\theta\sin\theta_{dL} \\ \sin\tilde\theta\cos\theta_{uL} & \cos\tilde\theta\cos\theta_{uL}\cos\theta_{dL}+e^{i\bar\phi}\sin\theta_{uL}\sin\theta_{dL} & \cos\tilde\theta\cos\theta_{uL}\sin\theta_{dL}-e^{i\bar\phi}\sin\theta_{uL}\cos\theta_{dL} \\ \sin\tilde\theta\sin\theta_{uL} & \cos\tilde\theta\sin\theta_{uL}\cos\theta_{dL}-e^{i\bar\phi}\cos\theta_{uL}\sin\theta_{dL} & \cos\tilde\theta\sin\theta_{uL}\sin\theta_{dL}+e^{i\bar\phi}\cos\theta_{uL}\cos\theta_{dL} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{65}$$

where

$$\tilde\theta = \theta_d-\theta_u, \quad \bar\phi = \phi_{dL}-\phi_{uL}. \tag{66}$$

The experimental values of the matrix elements and Jarlskog invariant in Eq.(172) are reproduced by putting

$$\tilde\theta = 13.3^\circ, \quad \theta_{uL} = 2.05^\circ, \quad \theta_{dL} = 0.99^\circ, \quad \bar\phi = -83.9^\circ. \tag{67}$$

In ref. [13], it is assumed that the VEVs of Higgs S_3 doublets are fixed in the direction of $\theta_u = \theta_d = \frac{\pi}{4}$, which enforces $\tilde\theta = 0$ (and predicts the atmospheric neutrino mixing angle is maximal). This means the Cabibbo angle is zero. In contrast, there is no such a condition of vacuum directions in this model.

Due to an overabundance of free parameters, there is no prediction in quark sector. But we can show that there exist consistent parameter sets. For example, if we put

$$\begin{array}{llll} \alpha = 0.00^\circ, & \beta = -83.9^\circ, & \gamma = 83.9^\circ, & \\ m_1^u = 1.28\text{ MeV}, & m_3^u = 172\text{ GeV}, & m_4^u = 17.2\text{ GeV}, & m_5^u = 6.23\text{ GeV}, \\ m_1^d = 2.91\text{ MeV}, & m_3^d = 1.94\text{ GeV}, & m_4^d = 2.14\text{ GeV}, & m_5^d = 74.2\text{ MeV}, \\ m_1^l = 1.75\text{ GeV}, & m_2^l = 487\text{ KeV}, & m_3^l = 103\text{ MeV}, & \end{array} \tag{68}$$

then the quark masses in Eq.(171) and the parameters of CKM matrix in Eq.(67) are reproduced. In this case, unknown mixing angles θ_{uR}, θ_{dR} and phases ϕ_{uR}, ϕ_{dR} are given by

$$\theta_{uR} = 5.70^\circ, \quad \theta_{dR} = 47.8^\circ, \quad \phi_{uR} = \phi_{uL} = 0.00^\circ, \quad \phi_{dR} = -\phi_{dL} = 83.9^\circ. \tag{69}$$

These parameters can be expressed by the perturbative Yukawa coupling constants and the VEVs of Higgs fields through Eq.(20), for example as follows:

$$\begin{array}{llll} v_u = 41.4\text{ GeV}, & v'_u = 150\text{ GeV}, & v_d = 60.0\text{ GeV}, & v'_d = 49.5\text{ GeV}, \\ \left|Y_1^U\right| = 8.53\times10^{-6}, & \left|Y_3^U\right| = 1.15, & \left|Y_4^U\right| = 0.415, & \left|Y_5^U\right| = 0.150, \\ \left|Y_1^D\right| = 5.87\times10^{-5}, & \left|Y_3^D\right| = 0.0392, & \left|Y_4^D\right| = 0.0357, & \left|Y_5^D\right| = 1.23\times10^{-3}, \\ \left|Y_1^E\right| = 0.0292, & \left|Y_2^E\right| = 9.84\times10^{-6}, & \left|Y_3^E\right| = 1.72\times10^{-3}. & \end{array} \tag{70}$$

As all the coupling constants of the model are perturbative, it is consistent that the fundamental energy scale is much larger than the electroweak scale, which is the base of naturalness problem.

4 Higgs sector

Next, we define Higgs potential and solve its minimum condition approximately. With gauge symmetry in table 1 and flavor symmetry in table 2, superpotential of Higgs sector is given by

$$\begin{aligned} W_H &= \lambda_1 S_3(H_1^U H_1^D + H_2^U H_2^D) + \lambda_3 S_3 H_3^U H_3^D \\ &+ \lambda_4 H_3^U(S_1 H_1^D + S_2 H_2^D) + \lambda_5 H_3^D(S_1 H_1^U + S_2 H_2^U) \subset W_S, \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

where one can take, without any loss of the generalities, $\lambda_{1,3,4,5}$ as real, by redefinining of four arbitrary fields of $\{S_i, S_3, H_i^U, H_3^U, H_i^D, H_3^D\}$. However, this superpotential could have would-be goldstone bosons when all of the Higgs fields acquire VEVs, because of an accidental $O(2)$ symmetry induced by the common rotation of the S_4 doublet. In order to avoid the problem, we assume that the flavor symmetry should be explicitly broken in the soft scalar mass terms, which can play role in giving the controllable parameters for the direction of the $SU(2)$ doublet Higgs VEVs.

As the Higgs potential has too many unknown parameters, we make several assumptions. In the superpotential, we assume the parameters λ_i are hierarchical for examples, as follows:

$$\lambda_5 \ll \lambda_1 = 0.03 \ll \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 = 0.3. \tag{72}$$

Then, we can neglect the first and fourth term in W_H. Note that, too small λ_1 is not consistent with chargino mass bound $M_{chargino} > 94GeV$, and too large $\lambda_{3,4}$ make Y_3^U reach Landau pole below M_P. With this assumption, F-term and D-term contribution to Higgs potential is given by

$$\begin{aligned} V_{SUSY} &= \left|\lambda_3 H_3^U H_3^D\right|^2 + \left|\lambda_4 H_3^U H_1^D\right|^2 + \left|\lambda_4 H_3^U H_2^D\right|^2 \\ &+ \left|\lambda_3 S_3 H_3^D + \lambda_4(S_1 H_1^D + S_2 H_2^D)\right|^2 \\ &+ \left|\lambda_3 S_3 H_3^U\right|^2 + \left|\lambda_4 H_3^U S_1\right|^2 + \left|\lambda_4 H_3^U S_2\right|^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{8} g_2^2 \sum_{A=1}^{3} \left[(H_a^U)^\dagger \sigma_A H_a^U + (H_a^D)^\dagger \sigma_A H_a^D\right]^2 + \frac{1}{8} g_Y^2 \left[|H_a^U|^2 - |H_a^D|^2\right]^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} g_x^2 \left[x_{H^U}|H_a^U|^2 + x_{H^D}|H_a^D|^2 + x_S|S_a|^2\right]^2, \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

where index a runs $a = 1, 2, 3$, and flavor symmetric SUSY breaking terms are given by

$$\begin{aligned} V_{SB} &= m_{H^U}^2(|H_1^U|^2 + |H_2^U|^2) - m_{H_3^U}^2|H_3^U|^2 + m_{H^D}^2(|H_1^D|^2 + |H_2^D|^2) + m_{H_3^D}^2|H_3^D|^2 \\ &+ m_S^2(|S_1|^2 + |S_2|^2) - m_{S_3}^2|S_3|^2 \\ &- \left\{\lambda_3 A_3 S_3 H_3^U H_3^D + \lambda_4 A_4 H_3^U(S_1 H_1^D + S_2 H_2^D) + h.c.\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

where all parameters in V_{SB} can be real in some SUSY breaking scenario, for example, in the case that A-parameters are induced by gaugino mass through RGEs, A-parameters become real. In order to avoid goldstone bosons, we assume flavor violation in soft scalar mass terms, and add flavor violating terms as follows:

$$V_{SBFB} = -m_{BH^U}^2(H_3^U)^\dagger(H_1^U c_{H^U} + H_2^U s_{H^U}) - m_{BS}^2(S_3)^\dagger(S_1 c_S + S_2 s_S) + h.c., \tag{75}$$

where we assume flavor violation is induced by VEV of S_4 doublet Z_2 odd auxiliary field in hidden sector. In this paper, we do not consider hidden sector which is beyond our paper. With this assumption, the term $m_{H^D}^2(H_3^D)^\dagger(H_1^D c_{H^D} + H_2^D s_{H^D})$ should be included in V_{SBFB}. Here we assume this term is approximately negligible. In this approximation, all parameters of potential $V = V_{SUSY} + V_{SB} + V_{SBFB}$ are real, because we can remove the phases of $m_{BH^U}^2$ and m_{BS}^2 by field redefinition. After the redefinition, three phases of $m_{BH^U,BH^D,BS}^2$ are transformed into $\lambda_{1,5}, m_{BH^D}^2$ which are assumed to be small and negligible.

From the defined potential above, the potential minimum conditions are given by

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \frac{\partial V}{\partial H_1^U}/(v_u c_u) &= m_{H^U}^2 - m_{BH^U}^2 c_{H^U}(v_u'/v_u c_u) + g_x^2 x_{H^U} x_S(v_s^2 + (v_s')^2) \\ &+ \Bigg\{\frac{1}{4}(g_Y^2 + g_2^2)(v_u^2 + (v_u')^2 - v_d^2 - (v_d')^2) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \quad g_x^2 x_{H^U}[x_{H^U}(v_u^2+(v_u')^2)+x_{H^D}(v_d^2+(v_d')^2)]\} \,, \end{aligned}\tag{76}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0=\frac{\partial V}{\partial H_2^U}/(v_u s_u) \quad &= \quad m_{H^U}^2 - m_{BH^U}^2 s_{H^U}(v_u'/v_u s_u) + g_x^2 x_{H^U} x_S (v_s^2+(v_s')^2) \\ &+ \quad \Big\{\frac{1}{4}(g_Y^2+g_2^2)(v_u^2+(v_u')^2-v_d^2-(v_d')^2) \\ &+ \quad g_x^2 x_{H^U}[x_{H^U}(v_u^2+(v_u')^2)+x_{H^D}(v_d^2+(v_d')^2)]\} \,, \end{aligned}\tag{77}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0=\frac{\partial V}{\partial H_3^U}/v_u' \quad &= \quad -m_{H_3^U}^2 - \lambda_3 A_3 v_s'(v_d'/v_u') - \lambda_4 A_4[v_s c_s(v_d c_d/v_u') + v_s s_s(v_d s_d/v_u')] \\ &- \quad m_{BH^U}^2[c_{H^U}(v_u c_u/v_u') + s_{H^U}(v_u s_u/v_u')] \\ &+ \quad \lambda_3^2(v_s')^2 + \lambda_4^2 v_s^2 + g_x^2 x_{H^U} x_S(v_s^2+(v_s')^2) \\ &+ \quad \Big\{\lambda_3^2(v_d')^2 + \lambda_4^2 v_d^2 + \frac{1}{4}(g_Y^2+g_2^2)(v_u^2+(v_u')^2-v_d^2-(v_d')^2) \\ &+ \quad g_x^2 x_{H^U}[x_{H^U}(v_u^2+(v_u')^2)+x_{H^D}(v_d^2+(v_d')^2)]\} \,, \end{aligned}\tag{78}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0=\frac{\partial V}{\partial H_1^D}/(v_d c_d) \quad &= \quad m_{H^D}^2 - \lambda_4 A_4 v_u'(v_s c_s/v_d c_d) + \lambda_4(v_s c_s/v_d c_d)[\lambda_3 v_s' v_d' + \lambda_4(v_s c_s v_d c_d + v_s s_s v_d s_d)] \\ &+ \quad g_x^2 x_{H^D} x_S(v_s^2+(v_s')^2) \\ &+ \quad \Big\{\lambda_4^2(v_u')^2 - \frac{1}{4}(g_Y^2+g_2^2)(v_u^2+(v_u')^2-v_d^2-(v_d')^2) \\ &+ \quad g_x^2 x_{H^D}[x_{H^U}(v_u^2+(v_u')^2)+x_{H^D}(v_d^2+(v_d')^2)]\} \,, \end{aligned}\tag{79}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0=\frac{\partial V}{\partial H_2^D}/(v_d s_d) \quad &= \quad m_{H^D}^2 - \lambda_4 A_4 v_u'(v_s s_s/v_d s_d) + \lambda_4(v_s s_s/v_d s_d)[\lambda_3 v_s' v_d' + \lambda_4(v_s c_s v_d c_d + v_s s_s v_d s_d)] \\ &+ \quad g_x^2 x_{H^D} x_S(v_s^2+(v_s')^2) \\ &+ \quad \Big\{\lambda_4^2(v_u')^2 - \frac{1}{4}(g_Y^2+g_2^2)(v_u^2+(v_u')^2-v_d^2-(v_d')^2) \\ &+ \quad g_x^2 x_{H^D}[x_{H^U}(v_u^2+(v_u')^2)+x_{H^D}(v_d^2+(v_d')^2)]\} \,, \end{aligned}\tag{80}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0=\frac{\partial V}{\partial H_3^D}/v_d' \quad &= \quad m_{H_3^D}^2 - \lambda_3 A_3 v_s'(v_u'/v_d') + \lambda_3(v_s'/v_d')[\lambda_3 v_s' v_d' + \lambda_4(v_s c_s v_d c_d + v_s s_s v_d s_d)] \\ &+ \quad g_x^2 x_{H^D} x_S(v_s^2+(v_s')^2) \\ &+ \quad \Big\{\lambda_3^2(v_u')^2 - \frac{1}{4}(g_Y^2+g_2^2)(v_u^2+(v_u')^2-v_d^2-(v_d')^2) \\ &+ \quad g_x^2 x_{H^D}[x_{H^U}(v_u^2+(v_u')^2)+x_{H^D}(v_d^2+(v_d')^2)]\} \,, \end{aligned}\tag{81}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0=\frac{\partial V}{\partial S_1}/(v_s c_s) \quad &= \quad m_S^2 - m_{BS}^2(v_s'/v_s c_s)c_S + g_x^2 x_S^2(v_s^2+(v_s')^2) \\ &+ \quad \{-\lambda_4 A_4 v_u'(v_d c_d/v_s c_s) + \lambda_4^2(v_u')^2 + \lambda_4(v_d c_d/v_s c_s)[\lambda_3 v_s' v_d' + \lambda_4(v_s c_s v_d c_d + v_s s_s v_d s_d)] \\ &+ \quad g_x^2 x_S[x_{H^U}(v_u^2+(v_u')^2)+x_{H^D}(v_d^2+(v_d')^2)]\} \,, \end{aligned}\tag{82}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0=\frac{\partial V}{\partial S_2}/(v_s s_s) \quad &= \quad m_S^2 - m_{BS}^2(v_s'/v_s s_s)s_S + g_x^2 x_S^2(v_s^2+(v_s')^2) \\ &+ \quad \{-\lambda_4 A_4 v_u'(v_d s_d/v_s s_s) + \lambda_4^2(v_u')^2 + \lambda_4(v_d s_d/v_s s_s)[\lambda_3 v_s' v_d' + \lambda_4(v_s c_s v_d c_d + v_s s_s v_d s_d)] \\ &+ \quad g_x^2 x_S[x_{H^U}(v_u^2+(v_u')^2)+x_{H^D}(v_d^2+(v_d')^2)]\} \,, \end{aligned}\tag{83}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0=\frac{\partial V}{\partial S_3}/v_s' \quad &= \quad -m_{S_3}^2 - m_{BS}^2[(v_s c_s/v_s')c_S + (v_s s_s/v_s')s_S] + g_x^2 x_S^2(v_s^2+(v_s')^2) \\ &+ \quad \{-\lambda_3 A_3 v_u'(v_d'/v_s') + \lambda_3^2(v_u')^2 + \lambda_3(v_d'/v_s')[\lambda_3 v_s' v_d' + \lambda_4(v_s c_s v_d c_d + v_s s_s v_d s_d)] \\ &+ \quad g_x^2 x_S[x_{H^U}(v_u^2+(v_u')^2)+x_{H^D}(v_d^2+(v_d')^2)]\} \,, \end{aligned}\tag{84}$$

where we define the VEVs of the G_{SM} singlet as

$$\langle S_1\rangle = v_s\cos\theta_s, \quad \langle S_2\rangle = v_s\sin\theta_s, \quad \langle S_3\rangle = v_s', \tag{85}$$

and hereafter we neglect the terms in bracket $\{\quad\}$, because those are very small (Note that $v_{u,d}, v_{u,d}' \ll$

v_s, v_s'.). Solving the Eqs.(76)-(84), we get

$$m_{BS}^2(v_s'/v_s)\left(\frac{c_S}{c_s}-\frac{s_S}{s_s}\right)=0 \quad (\therefore \quad \theta_s=\theta_S), \tag{86}$$

$$m_S^2 - m_{BS}^2(v_s'/v_s) + g_x^2 x_S^2(v_s^2+(v_s')^2)=0, \tag{87}$$

$$-m_{S_3}^2 - m_{BS}^2(v_s/v_s') + g_x^2 x_S^2(v_s^2+(v_s')^2)=0, \tag{88}$$

$$\lambda_4\left[\lambda_3 v_s' v_d' + \lambda_4 v_s v_d(c_s c_d + s_s s_d) - A_4 v_u'\right]\left(\frac{c_s}{c_d}-\frac{s_s}{s_d}\right)\frac{v_s}{v_d}=0 \quad (\therefore \quad \theta_d=\theta_s), \tag{89}$$

$$m_{H^D}^2 - \lambda_4 A_4 v_s(v_u'/v_d) + \lambda_3\lambda_4 v_s v_s'(v_d'/v_d) + \lambda_4^2 v_s^2 + g_x^2 x_S x_{H^D}(v_s^2+(v_s')^2)=0, \tag{90}$$

$$m_{H_3^D}^2 - \lambda_3 A_3 v_s'(v_u'/v_d') + \lambda_3^2(v_s')^2 + \lambda_3\lambda_4 v_s v_s'(v_d/v_d') + g_x^2 x_S x_{H^D}(v_s^2+(v_s')^2)=0, \tag{91}$$

$$m_{BH^U}^2(v_u'/v_u)\left(\frac{c_{H^U}}{c_u}-\frac{s_{H^U}}{s_u}\right)=0 \quad (\therefore \quad \theta_u=\theta_{H^U}), \tag{92}$$

$$m_{H^U}^2 - m_{BH^U}^2(v_u'/v_u) + g_x^2 x_S x_{H^U}(v_s^2+(v_s')^2)=0, \tag{93}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&-m_{H_3^U}^2 - \lambda_3 A_3 v_s'(v_d'/v_u') - \lambda_4 A_4 v_s(v_d/v_u') - m_{BH^U}^2(v_u/v_u')\\ &\quad +\lambda_3^2(v_s')^2 + \lambda_4^2 v_s^2 + g_x^2 x_S x_{H^U}(v_s^2+(v_s')^2)=0.\end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

Using Eqs.(86)-(94), mass matrices of neutral CP-even (ϕ) and CP-odd (ρ) Higgs bosons are given by

$$M_\phi^2 = \begin{pmatrix} M_{uu}^2 & M_{ud}^2 & 0 \\ M_{du}^2 & M_{dd}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & M_{ss}^2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{95}$$

$$M_\rho^2 = \begin{pmatrix} M_{uu}^2 & -M_{ud}^2 & 0 \\ -M_{du}^2 & M_{dd}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \bar{M}_{ss}^2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{96}$$

$$M_{ss}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} m_{BS}^2(v_s'/v_s)+2g_x^2x_S^2(v_sc_s)^2 & 2g_x^2x_S^2v_s^2c_ss_s & -m_{BS}^2c_s+2g_x^2x_S^2v_sv_s'c_s \\ 2g_x^2x_S^2v_s^2c_ss_s & m_{BS}^2(v_s'/v_s)+2g_x^2x_S^2(v_ss_s)^2 & -m_{BS}^2s_s+2g_x^2x_S^2v_sv_s's_s \\ -m_{BS}^2c_s+2g_x^2x_S^2v_sv_s'c_s & -m_{BS}^2s_s+2g_x^2x_S^2v_sv_s's_s & m_{BS}^2(v_s/v_s')+2g_x^2x_S^2(v_s')^2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{97}$$

$$\bar{M}_{ss}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} m_{BS}^2(v_s'/v_s) & 0 & -m_{BS}^2c_s \\ 0 & m_{BS}^2(v_s'/v_s) & -m_{BS}^2s_s \\ -m_{BS}^2c_s & -m_{BS}^2s_s & m_{BS}^2(v_s/v_s') \end{pmatrix}, \tag{98}$$

$$M_{uu}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} m_{BH^U}^2(v_u'/v_u) & 0 & -m_{BH^U}^2c_u \\ 0 & m_{Bu}^2(v_u'/v_u) & -m_{BH^U}^2s_u \\ -m_{BH^U}^2c_u & -m_{BH^U}^2s_u & m_{BH^U}^2(v_u/v_u')+\lambda_3A_3v_s'(v_d'/v_u')+\lambda_4A_4v_s(v_d/v_u') \end{pmatrix}, \tag{99}$$

$$\begin{aligned} M_{dd}^2 &= \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda_4^2(v_ss_s)^2-\lambda_3\lambda_4v_sv_s'(v_d'/v_d) & \lambda_4^2v_s^2c_ss_s & \lambda_3\lambda_4v_sv_s'c_s \\ \lambda_4^2v_s^2c_ss_s & -\lambda_4^2(v_sc_s)^2-\lambda_3\lambda_4v_sv_s'(v_d'/v_d) & \lambda_3\lambda_4v_sv_s's_s \\ \lambda_3\lambda_4v_sv_s'c_s & \lambda_3\lambda_4v_sv_s's_s & -\lambda_3\lambda_4v_sv_s'(v_d/v_d') \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_4A_4v_s(v_u'/v_d) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_4A_4v_s(v_u'/v_d) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3A_3v_s'(v_u'/v_d') \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

$$M_{ud}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\lambda_4A_4v_sc_s & -\lambda_4A_4v_ss_s & -\lambda_3A_3v_s' \end{pmatrix} = (M_{du}^2)^t, \tag{101}$$

where $v_u, v_u', v_d, v_d' \ll v_s, v_s'$ is assumed and defined as

$$(H_i^U)^0 = \frac{\phi_{u,i}+i\rho_{u,i}}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad (H_i^D)^0 = \frac{\phi_{d,i}+i\rho_{d,i}}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad S_i = \frac{\phi_{s,i}+i\rho_{s,i}}{\sqrt{2}} \quad (i=1,2,3). \tag{102}$$

Hereafter we do not consider ϕ_s, ρ_s, because these fields do not mix with $\phi_{u,d}, \rho_{u,d}$ and never contribute FCNC. Because the mass matrices are partially diagonalized as follows

$$(M_{uu}^2)' = V_u^t M_{uu}^2 V_u$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} m^2_{BH^U}(v'_u/v_u) & 0 & -m^2_{BH^U} \\ 0 & m^2_{BH^U}(v'_u/v_u) & 0 \\ -m^2_{BH^U} & 0 & m^2_{BH^U}(v_u/v'_u)+\lambda_3 A_3 v'_s(v'_d/v'_u)+\lambda_4 A_4 v_s(v_d/v'_u) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{103}$$

$$(M^2_{dd})' = V^t_d M^2_{dd} V_d = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_4 v_s[A_4(v'_u/v_d)-\lambda_3 v'_s(v'_d/v_d)] & 0 & \lambda_3\lambda_4 v_s v'_s \\ 0 & M^2_{\phi'_{d,2}} & 0 \\ \lambda_3\lambda_4 v_s v'_s & 0 & \lambda_3 v'_s[A_3(v'_u/v'_d)-\lambda_4 v_s(v_d/v'_d)] \end{pmatrix},$$

$$M^2_{\phi'_{d,2}} = \lambda_4 v_s[A_4(v'_u/v_d)-\lambda_4 v_s-\lambda_3 v'_s(v'_d/v_d)], \tag{104}$$

$$(M^2_{ud})' = V^t_u M^2_{ud} V_d = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\lambda_4 A_4 v_s & 0 & -\lambda_3 A_3 v'_s \end{pmatrix}, \tag{105}$$

where V_u and V_d are defined in Eq. (39) and Eq. (53), respectively, one can see that the mixed states

$$\phi'_{u,2} = -\phi_{u,1}s_u + \phi_{u,2}c_u, \quad \rho'_{u,2} = -\rho_{u,1}s_u + \rho_{u,2}c_u \tag{106}$$

$$\phi'_{d,2} = -\phi_{d,1}s_d + \phi_{d,2}c_d, \quad \rho'_{d,2} = -\rho_{d,1}s_d + \rho_{d,2}c_d \tag{107}$$

are mass eigenstates. Note that CP-even Higgs bosons $\phi'_{u,2}, \phi'_{d,2}$ and CP-odd Higgs bosons $\rho'_{u,2}, \rho'_{d,2}$ have the same mass eigenvalues in this approximation, respectively.

5 Cancellation of Higgs and SUSY-FCNC Contributions

Finally, we evaluate the Higgs and SUSY contributions to FCNC. Here we calculate $K^0-\bar{K}^0$, $B^0-\bar{B}^0$ and $D^0-\bar{D}^0$ mass differences.

5.1 Higgs contributions

First, we explain how Higgs bosons mediate FCNCs. Yukawa coupling interactions of quarks and charged leptons between neutral Higgs bosons are given by

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{L}_Y &= (\bar{u}_1,\bar{u}_2,\bar{u}_3)_R \begin{pmatrix} Y^U_1(H^U_3)^0 & 0 & Y^U_4(H^U_1)^0 \\ 0 & Y^U_1(H^U_3)^0 & Y^U_4(H^U_2)^0 \\ Y^U_5(H^U_1)^0 & Y^U_5(H^U_2)^0 & Y^U_3(H^U_3)^0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \\ u_3 \end{pmatrix}_L \\ &+ (\bar{d}_1,\bar{d}_2,\bar{d}_3)_R \begin{pmatrix} Y^D_1(H^D_3)^0 & 0 & Y^D_4(H^D_1)^0 \\ 0 & Y^D_1(H^D_3)^0 & Y^D_4(H^D_2)^0 \\ Y^D_5(H^D_1)^0 & Y^D_5(H^D_2)^0 & Y^D_3(H^D_3)^0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d_1 \\ d_2 \\ d_3 \end{pmatrix}_L \\ &+ (\bar{l}_1,\bar{l}_2,\bar{l}_3)_R \begin{pmatrix} Y^E_1(H^D_1)^0 & Y^E_1(H^D_2)^0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Y^E_2(H^D_3)^0 \\ -Y^E_3(H^D_2)^0 & Y^E_3(H^D_1)^0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} l_1 \\ l_2 \\ l_3 \end{pmatrix}_L + h.c.. \end{aligned} \tag{108}$$

With the basis that quark and lepton mass matrices are diagonal, these terms are rewritten by

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{L}_Y &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\bar{u},\bar{c},\bar{t})_R \begin{pmatrix} Y^U_1(\phi_{u,3}+i\rho_{u,3}) & Y^U_4 s_{uL}(\phi'_{u,2}+i\rho'_{u,2}) & -Y^U_4 c_{uL}(\phi'_{u,2}+i\rho'_{u,2}) \\ Y^U_5 s_{uR}(\phi'_{u,2}+i\rho'_{u,2}) & H^U_{22} & H^U_{23} \\ -Y^U_5 c_{uR}(\phi'_{u,2}+i\rho'_{u,2}) & H^U_{32} & H^U_{33} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ c \\ t \end{pmatrix}_L \\ &+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\bar{d},\bar{s},\bar{b})_R \begin{pmatrix} Y^D_1(\phi_{d,3}+i\rho_{d,3}) & \eta Y^D_4 s_{dL}(\phi'_{d,2}+i\rho'_{d,2}) & -\eta Y^D_4 c_{dL}(\phi'_{d,2}+i\rho'_{d,2}) \\ \eta Y^D_5 s_{dR}(\phi'_{d,2}+i\rho'_{d,2}) & H^D_{22} & H^D_{23} \\ -\eta Y^D_5 c_{dR}(\phi'_{d,2}+i\rho'_{d,2}) & H^D_{32} & H^D_{33} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \\ b \end{pmatrix}_L \\ &+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\bar{e},\bar{\mu},\bar{\tau})_R \begin{pmatrix} -Y^E_2(\phi_{d,3}+i\rho_{d,3}) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Y^E_3(\phi'_{d,1}+i\rho'_{d,1}) & -Y^E_3(\phi'_{d,2}+i\rho'_{d,2}) \\ 0 & Y^E_1(\phi'_{d,2}+i\rho'_{d,2}) & Y^E_1(\phi'_{d,1}+i\rho'_{d,1}) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e \\ \mu \\ \tau \end{pmatrix}_L + h.c., \end{aligned} \tag{109}$$

$$\begin{aligned} H^U_{22} &= [Y^U_1 c_{uR}(\phi_{u,3}+i\rho_{u,3}) - Y^U_5 s_{uR}(\phi'_{u,1}+i\rho'_{u,1})]c_{uL} \\ &- [Y^U_4 c_{uR}(\phi'_{u,1}+i\rho'_{u,1}) - |Y^U_3| s_{uR}(\phi_{u,3}+i\rho_{u,3})]s_{uL}, \end{aligned} \tag{110}$$

$$H^U_{23} = [Y^U_1 c_{uR}(\phi_{u,3}+i\rho_{u,3}) - Y^U_5 s_{uR}(\phi'_{u,1}+i\rho'_{u,1})]s_{uL}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ && [Y_4^U c_{uR}(\phi'_{u,1}+i\rho'_{u,1}) - |Y_3^U| s_{uR}(\phi_{u,3}+i\rho_{u,3})]c_{uL}, && (111)\\ H_{32}^U &= && [Y_1^U s_{uR}(\phi_{u,3}+i\rho_{u,3}) + Y_5^U c_{uR}(\phi'_{u,1}+i\rho'_{u,1})]c_{uL} && \\ &- && [Y_4^U s_{uR}(\phi'_{u,1}+i\rho'_{u,1}) + |Y_3^U| c_{uR}(\phi_{u,3}+i\rho_{u,3})]s_{uL}, && (112)\\ H_{33}^U &= && [Y_1^U s_{uR}(\phi_{u,3}+i\rho_{u,3}) + Y_5^U c_{uR}(\phi'_{u,1}+i\rho'_{u,1})]s_{uL} && \\ &+ && [Y_4^U s_{uR}(\phi'_{u,1}+i\rho'_{u,1}) + |Y_3^U| c_{uR}(\phi_{u,3}+i\rho_{u,3})]c_{uL}, && (113)\\ H_{22}^D &= && [Y_1^D c_{dR}(\phi_{d,3}+i\rho_{d,3}) - \eta Y_5^D s_{dR}(\phi'_{d,1}+i\rho'_{d,1})]c_{dL} && \\ &- && \eta[Y_4^D c_{dR}(\phi'_{d,1}+i\rho'_{d,1}) - \eta |Y_3^D| s_{dR}(\phi_{d,3}+i\rho_{d,3})]s_{dL}, && (114)\\ H_{23}^D &= && [Y_1^D c_{dR}(\phi_{d,3}+i\rho_{d,3}) - \eta Y_5^D s_{dR}(\phi'_{d,1}+i\rho'_{d,1})]s_{dL} && \\ &+ && \eta[Y_4^D c_{dR}(\phi'_{d,1}+i\rho'_{d,1}) - \eta |Y_3^D| s_{dR}(\phi_{d,3}+i\rho_{d,3})]c_{dL}, && (115)\\ H_{32}^D &= && [Y_1^D s_{dR}(\phi_{d,3}+i\rho_{d,3}) + \eta Y_5^D c_{dR}(\phi'_{d,1}+i\rho'_{d,1})]c_{dL} && \\ &- && \eta[Y_4^D s_{dR}(\phi'_{d,1}+i\rho'_{d,1}) + \eta |Y_3^D| c_{dR}(\phi_{d,3}+i\rho_{d,3})]s_{dL}, && (116)\\ H_{33}^D &= && [Y_1^D s_{dR}(\phi_{d,3}+i\rho_{d,3}) + \eta Y_5^D c_{dR}(\phi'_{d,1}+i\rho'_{d,1})]s_{dL} && \\ &+ && \eta[Y_4^D s_{dR}(\phi'_{d,1}+i\rho'_{d,1}) + \eta |Y_3^D| c_{dR}(\phi_{d,3}+i\rho_{d,3})]c_{dL}, && (117)\\ \eta &= && e^{-i\gamma}, && (118) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\phi'_{u,1} = \phi_{u,1}c_u + \phi_{u,2}s_u, \quad \rho'_{u,1} = \rho_{u,1}c_u + \rho_{u,2}s_u, \tag{119}$$

$$\phi'_{d,1} = \phi_{d,1}c_d + \phi_{d,2}s_d, \quad \rho'_{d,1} = \rho_{d,1}c_d + \rho_{d,2}s_d. \tag{120}$$

From these interactions, we can evaluate FCNC processes. For example, one can see that $\phi'_{d,2}$ and $\rho'_{d,2}$ mediate flavor changing operator such as $(\bar{d}_R d_L)(\bar{d}_L s_R)$,which contributes $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mass difference Δm_K. Note that the terms $(\bar{d}_R s_L)(\bar{d}_R s_L)$ and $(\bar{d}_L s_R)(\bar{d}_L s_R)$ are not induced because contributions to them from $\phi'_{d,2}$ and $\rho'_{d,2}$ are cancelled due to degeneration of masses. However, lepton flavor changing processes such as $\mu \to e\gamma$, $\tau \to \mu\gamma$ and $\tau \to e\gamma$ are not induced.

Flavor violating effective interactions are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{Higgs-FCNC} &= \frac{Y_4^U Y_5^U s_{uL}s_{uR}}{m^2_{\phi'_{u,2}}}(\bar{u}_{R,\alpha}c_L^\alpha)(\bar{u}_{L,\beta}c_R^\beta) + \frac{Y_4^D Y_5^D s_{dL}s_{dR}}{m^2_{\phi'_{d,2}}}(\bar{d}_{R,\alpha}s_L^\alpha)(\bar{d}_{L,\beta}s_R^\beta) \\ &+ \frac{Y_4^D Y_5^D c_{dL}c_{dR}}{m^2_{\phi'_{d,2}}}(\bar{d}_{R,\alpha}b_L^\alpha)(\bar{d}_{L,\beta}b_R^\beta), \end{aligned} \tag{121}$$

where α and β are color indices. From this Lagrangian, we can evaluate the Higgs contributions to Δm_K, Δm_B and Δm_D as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta m_K)_{Higgs} &= 2Re\left\langle K^0 | (-\mathcal{L}_{Higgs-FCNC}) | \bar{K}^0 \right\rangle \\ &= -2\frac{Y_4^D Y_5^D s_{dL}s_{dR}}{m^2_{\phi'_{d,2}}}\left\langle K^0 \left| (\bar{d}_{R,\alpha}s_L^\alpha)(\bar{d}_{L,\beta}s_R^\beta) \right| \bar{K}^0 \right\rangle, && (122)\\ (\Delta m_B)_{Higgs} &= 2Re\left\langle B^0 | (-\mathcal{L}_{Higgs-FCNC}) | \bar{B}^0 \right\rangle \\ &= -2\frac{Y_4^D Y_5^D c_{dL}c_{dR}}{m^2_{\phi'_{d,2}}}\left\langle B^0 \left| (\bar{d}_{R,\alpha}b_L^\alpha)(\bar{d}_{L,\beta}b_R^\beta) \right| \bar{B}^0 \right\rangle, && (123)\\ (\Delta m_D)_{Higgs} &= 2Re\left\langle D^0 | (-\mathcal{L}_{Higgs-FCNC}) | \bar{D}^0 \right\rangle \\ &= -2\frac{Y_4^U Y_5^U s_{uL}s_{uR}}{m^2_{\phi'_{u,2}}}\left\langle D^0 \left| (\bar{u}_{R,\alpha}c_L^\alpha)(\bar{u}_{L,\beta}c_R^\beta) \right| \bar{D}^0 \right\rangle, && (124) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\left\langle K^0 \left| (\bar{d}_{R,\alpha}s_L^\alpha)(\bar{d}_{L,\beta}s_R^\beta) \right| \bar{K}^0 \right\rangle = \left[\frac{1}{24} + \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{m_{K^0}}{m_s(2GeV) + m_d(2GeV)}\right)^2\right] m_{K^0} f_K^2$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= 6.56 \times 10^7 MeV^3, && (125)\\
\left\langle B^0 \left| (\bar{d}_{R,\alpha} b^\alpha_L)(\bar{d}_{L,\beta} b^\beta_R) \right| \bar{B}^0 \right\rangle &= \left[\frac{1}{24} + \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{m_{B^0}}{m_b(m_b) + m_d(m_b)} \right)^2 \right] m_{B^0} f_B^2 = 9.21 \times 10^7 MeV^3, && (126)\\
\left\langle D^0 \left| (\bar{u}_{R,\alpha} c^\alpha_L)(\bar{u}_{L,\beta} c^\beta_R) \right| \bar{D}^0 \right\rangle &= \left[\frac{1}{24} + \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{m_{D^0}}{m_c(m_c) + m_u(m_c)} \right)^2 \right] m_{D^0} f_D^2 = 4.99 \times 10^7 MeV^3, && (127)
\end{aligned}
$$

which are evaluated by using the parameters given in appendix. Requiring $|(\Delta m_M)_{Higgs}| < \Delta m_M (M = K, B, D)$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
m_{\phi'_{d,2}} &> 4.6 TeV \quad (\Delta m_K), && (128)\\
m_{\phi'_{d,2}} &> 4.0 TeV \quad (\Delta m_B), && (129)\\
m_{\phi'_{u,2}} &> 37.6 TeV \quad (\Delta m_D). && (130)
\end{aligned}
$$

These constraints are too strong. In our model, SUSY contributions to FCNC may be used to cancel these Higgs contributions. However, in order to suppress $\Delta m_{K,B,D}$, we must give three cancellation conditions:

$$
|(\Delta m_M)_{Higgs} + (\Delta m_M)_{SUSY}| \ll |(\Delta m_M)_{Higgs}| \quad (M = K, B, D), \qquad (131)
$$

which is unnatural. In the next subsection, we show the number of cancellation conditions are reduced to two from three.

5.2 Squark and gluino contributions

Now we evaluate SUSY-FCNC contributions. As we assume Δm_D is suppressed by cancellation:

$$
|(\Delta m_D)_{Higgs} + (\Delta m_D)_{SUSY}| \ll |(\Delta m_D)_{Higgs}|, \qquad (132)
$$

we consider only $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ and $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ mass differences induced by squark and gluino box diagrams. These contributions depend only on down type squark mass matrices. Considering the following squark Lagrangian

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\mathcal{L}_{squark} &= m_Q^2(|Q_1|^2 + |Q_2|^2) + m_{Q_3}^2 |Q_3|^2 + m_D^2(|D_1^c|^2 + |D_2^c|^2) + m_{D_3}^2 |D_3^c|^2 \\
&+ \left\{ e^{-i\phi_Q} |m_{BQ}^2| Q_3^\dagger (c_Q Q_1 + s_Q Q_2) + e^{i\phi_D} |m_{BD}^2| (D_3^c)^\dagger (c_D D_1^c + s_D D_2^c) + h.c. \right\} \\
&+ (D - terms), && (133)
\end{aligned}
$$

one can see that down type squark mass matrix is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\mathcal{L}_{down-squark} &= (D^\dagger, D^c) \begin{pmatrix} M_{LL}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & M_{RR}^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} D \\ (D^c)^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, && (134)\\
M_{LL}^2 &= \begin{pmatrix} m_Q^2 & 0 & e^{i\phi_Q}|m_{BQ}^2| c_Q \\ 0 & m_Q^2 & e^{i\phi_Q}|m_{BQ}^2| s_Q \\ e^{-i\phi_Q}|m_{BQ}^2| c_Q & e^{-i\phi_Q}|m_{BQ}^2| s_Q & m_{Q_3}^2 \end{pmatrix}, && (135)\\
M_{RR}^2 &= \begin{pmatrix} m_D^2 & 0 & e^{i\phi_D}|m_{BD}^2| c_D \\ 0 & m_D^2 & e^{i\phi_D}|m_{BD}^2| s_D \\ e^{-i\phi_D}|m_{BD}^2| c_D & e^{-i\phi_D}|m_{BD}^2| s_D & m_{D_3}^2 \end{pmatrix}. && (136)
\end{aligned}
$$

Where D-term contributions are absorbed into m_{Q,Q_3,D,D_3}^2. In super-CKM basis, squark mass matrices are given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
(M_{LL}^2)' &= V_{dL}^\dagger M_{LL}^2 V_{dL} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} m_Q^2 & \eta_Q |m_{BQ}^2| s_{Qd} s_{dL} & -\eta_Q |m_{BQ}^2| s_{Qd} c_{dL} \\ \eta_Q^* |m_{BQ}^2| s_{Qd} s_{dL} & (M_{Ld}^2)_{22} & (M_{Ld}^2)_{23} \\ -\eta_Q^* |m_{BQ}^2| s_{Qd} c_{dL} & (M_{Ld}^2)_{23}^* & (M_{Ld}^2)_{33} \end{pmatrix}, && (137)\\
(M_{Ld}^2)_{22} &= m_Q^2 (c_{dL})^2 + m_{Q_3}^2 (s_{dL})^2 - |m_{BQ}^2| c_{Qd} s_{dL} c_{dL} (\eta_Q + \eta_Q^*), && (138)\\
(M_{Ld}^2)_{23} &= (m_Q^2 - m_{Q_3}^2) c_{dL} s_{dL} + |m_{BQ}^2| c_{Qd} (\eta_Q (c_{dL})^2 - \eta_Q^* (s_{dL})^2), && (139)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
(M_{Ld}^2)_{33} &= m_Q^2(s_{dL})^2 + m_{Q_3}^2(c_{dL})^2 + |m_{BQ}^2| c_{Qd} s_{dL} c_{dL}(\eta_Q + \eta_Q^*), & (140)\\
s_{Qd} &= \sin(\theta_Q - \theta_d), & (141)\\
\eta_Q &= \eta e^{i\phi_Q}, & (142)\\
(M_{RR}^2)' &= V_{dR}^\dagger M_{RR}^2 V_{dR} & \\
&= \left(\begin{array}{ccc} m_D^2 & \eta_D |m_{BD}^2| s_{Dd} s_{dR} & -\eta_D |m_{BD}^2| s_{Dd} c_{dR} \\ \eta_D^* |m_{BD}^2| s_{Dd} s_{dR} & (M_{Rd}^2)_{22} & (M_{Rd}^2)_{23} \\ -\eta_D^* |m_{BD}^2| s_{Dd} c_{dR} & (M_{Rd}^2)_{23}^* & (M_{Rd}^2)_{33} \end{array} \right), & (143)\\
(M_{Rd}^2)_{22} &= m_D^2(c_{dR})^2 + m_{D_3}^2(s_{dR})^2 - |m_{BD}^2| c_{Dd} s_{dR} c_{dR}(\eta_D + \eta_D^*), & (144)\\
(M_{Rd}^2)_{23} &= (m_D^2 - m_{D_3}^2) c_{dR} s_{dR} + |m_{BD}^2| c_{Dd}(\eta_D (c_{dR})^2 - \eta_D^* (s_{dR})^2), & (145)\\
(M_{Rd}^2)_{33} &= m_D^2(s_{dR})^2 + m_{D_3}^2(c_{dR})^2 + |m_{BD}^2| c_{Dd} s_{dR} c_{dR}(\eta_D + \eta_D^*), & (146)\\
s_{Dd} &= \sin(\theta_D - \theta_d), & (147)\\
\eta_D &= \eta^* e^{i\phi_D}. & (148)
\end{aligned}
$$

Here we assume degenerated mass squared parameters as

$$
m_Q^2 = m_{Q_3}^2, \quad m_D^2 = m_{D_3}^2, \tag{149}
$$

which are essential assumptions to realize cancellation between Higgs and SUSY-FCNC contributions. These relations are realized if gaugino mass contributions dominate in RGEs. With this assumption, diagonal elements of mass squared matrix are also degenerated approximately as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(M_{Ld}^2)_{22} \simeq (M_{Ld}^2)_{33} \simeq m_Q^2, & \quad (150)\\
(M_{Rd}^2)_{22} \simeq (M_{Rd}^2)_{33} \simeq m_D^2. & \quad (151)
\end{aligned}
$$

Where we assume that the contributions from $m_{BD,BQ}^2$ are negligible. Furthermore, we assume $\eta_Q = \eta_D = 1$ to suppress

$$
Im \left\langle K^0 | \mathcal{L}_{SUSY-FCNC} | \bar{K}^0 \right\rangle. \tag{152}
$$

Here flavor changing effective interactions induced by squark and gluino box diagrams are calculated in mass insertion approximation [14] as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{SUSY-FCNC} &= \frac{\alpha_3^2}{216 M_{Q,K}^2} \left\{ (\delta_{12})_{LL}^2 \left[24 x f_1(x) + 66 f_2(x)\right] O_1 + (\delta_{12})_{RR}^2 \left[24 x f_1(x) + 66 f_2(x)\right] O_2 \right.\\
&+ \left. (\delta_{12})_{LL} (\delta_{12})_{RR} \left[(504 x f_1(x) - 72 f_2(x)) O_3 + (24 x f_1(x) + 120 f_2(x)) O_4\right] \right\}\\
&+ \frac{\alpha_3^2}{216 M_{Q,B}^2} \left\{ (\delta_{13})_{LL}^2 \left[24 y f_1(y) + 66 f_2(y)\right] P_1 + (\delta_{13})_{RR}^2 \left[24 y f_1(y) + 66 f_2(y)\right] P_2 \right.\\
&+ \left. (\delta_{13})_{LL} (\delta_{13})_{RR} \left[(504 y f_1(y) - 72 f_2(y)) P_3 + (24 y f_1(y) + 120 f_2(y)) P_4\right] \right\}, \quad (153)
\end{aligned}
$$

where α_3 is $SU(3)_c$ gauge coupling, $M_{Q,K}$ and $M_{Q,B}$ are averaged squark mass, and the other parameters are defined as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f_1(x) = \frac{6(1+3x)\ln x + x^3 - 9x^2 - 9x + 17}{6(x-1)^5}, & (154)\\
& f_2(x) = \frac{6x(1+x)\ln x - x^3 - 9x^2 + 9x + 1}{3(x-1)^5}, & (155)\\
& O_1 = (\bar{d}_{L,\alpha} \gamma_\mu s_L^\alpha)(\bar{d}_{L,\beta} \gamma^\mu s_L^\beta), \quad P_1 = (\bar{d}_{L,\alpha} \gamma_\mu b_L^\alpha)(\bar{d}_{L,\beta} \gamma^\mu b_L^\beta), & (156)\\
& O_2 = (\bar{d}_{R,\alpha} \gamma_\mu s_R^\alpha)(\bar{d}_{R,\beta} \gamma^\mu s_R^\beta), \quad P_2 = (\bar{d}_{R,\alpha} \gamma_\mu b_R^\alpha)(\bar{d}_{R,\beta} \gamma^\mu b_R^\beta), & (157)\\
& O_3 = (\bar{d}_{R,\alpha} s_L^\alpha)(\bar{d}_{L,\beta} s_R^\beta), \quad P_3 = (\bar{d}_{R,\alpha} b_L^\alpha)(\bar{d}_{L,\beta} b_R^\beta), & (158)\\
& O_4 = (\bar{d}_{R,\alpha} s_L^\beta)(\bar{d}_{L,\beta} s_R^\alpha), \quad P_4 = (\bar{d}_{R,\alpha} b_L^\beta)(\bar{d}_{L,\beta} b_R^\alpha), & (159)\\
& (\delta_{12})_{LL} = \frac{|m_{BQ}^2| s_{Qd} s_{dL}}{M_{Q,K}^2}, \quad (\delta_{13})_{LL} = \frac{-|m_{BQ}^2| s_{Qd} c_{dL}}{M_{Q,B}^2}, & (160)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$(\delta_{12})_{RR} = \frac{|m_{BD}^2| s_{Dd} s_{dR}}{M_{Q,K}^2}, \quad (\delta_{13})_{RR} = \frac{-|m_{BD}^2| s_{Dd} c_{dR}}{M_{Q,B}^2}, \tag{161}$$

$$x = \frac{M_3^2}{M_{Q,K}^2}, \quad y = \frac{M_3^2}{M_{Q,B}^2}, \tag{162}$$

where M_3 is gluino mass. With the assumptions of Eqs.(150) and (151), one can assume $M_{Q,K}^2 = M_{Q,B}^2$. Note that the dominant contributions to Δm_K and Δm_B come from O_3 and P_3 in Eq.(153) due to the large coefficients. Total contributions to O_3 and P_3 from Higgs (Eq.(121)) and SUSY (Eq.(153)) are written as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{O_3} = \left[\frac{Y_4^D Y_5^D}{m_{\phi'_{d,2}}^2} + \frac{\alpha_3^2 |m_{BQ}^2 m_{BD}^2| s_{Qd} s_{Dd}}{216 M_{Q,K}^6} (504 x f_1(x) - 72 f_2(x)) \right] s_{dL} s_{dR} (\bar{d}_{R,\alpha} s_L^\alpha)(\bar{d}_{L,\beta} s_R^\beta), \tag{163}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{P_3} = \left[\frac{Y_4^D Y_5^D}{m_{\phi'_{d,2}}^2} + \frac{\alpha_3^2 |m_{BQ}^2 m_{BD}^2| s_{Qd} s_{Dd}}{216 M_{Q,K}^6} (504 x f_1(x) - 72 f_2(x)) \right] c_{dL} c_{dR} (\bar{d}_{R,\alpha} b_L^\alpha)(\bar{d}_{L,\beta} b_R^\beta). \tag{164}$$

If accidental cancellation occurs between the terms in bracket [ ], new physics contributions to Δm_K and Δm_B are well-suppressed at same time. Assuming $x = 1$ and $|m_{BQ}| s_{Qd} = -2|m_{BD}| s_{Dd}$, we get

$$f_1(1) = \frac{1}{20}, \quad f_2(1) = -\frac{1}{30}, \tag{165}$$

and cancellation condition:

$$\frac{Y_4^D Y_5^D}{m_{\phi'_{d,2}}^2} = 13.8 \frac{\alpha_3^2 (|m_{BQ}^2| s_{Qd})^2}{216 M_{Q,K}^6}. \tag{166}$$

One finds that Eq.(166) is satisfied, for example, if we put

$$\alpha_3 = 0.12, \quad m_{\phi'_{d,2}}^2 = M_{Q,K}^2, \quad \frac{|m_{BQ}^2 s_{Qd}|}{M_{Q,K}^2} = 0.218. \tag{167}$$

Then the sub-dominant contributions from Eq.(153) are evaluated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta m_K)_{SUSY} &= -\frac{Y_4^D Y_5^D}{13.8 M_{Q,K}^2} \times 2Re \left\langle K^0 \left| \left\{ - \left[s_{dL}^2 O_1 + \frac{1}{4} s_{dR}^2 O_2 \right] + \frac{2.8}{2} s_{dL} s_{dR} O_4 \right\} \right| \bar{K}^0 \right\rangle \\ &= 1.06 \times 10^{-12} \left(\frac{TeV}{M_{Q,K}} \right)^2 MeV, \end{aligned} \tag{168}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta m_B)_{SUSY} &= -\frac{Y_4^D Y_5^D}{13.8 M_{Q,K}^2} \times 2Re \left\langle B^0 \left| \left\{ - \left[c_{dL}^2 P_1 + \frac{1}{4} c_{dR}^2 P_2 \right] + \frac{2.8}{2} c_{dR} c_{dL} P_4 \right\} \right| \bar{B}^0 \right\rangle \\ &= 1.74 \times 10^{-10} \left(\frac{TeV}{M_{Q,K}} \right)^2 MeV, \end{aligned} \tag{169}$$

where

$$\langle K^0 | O_1 | \bar{K}^0 \rangle = \langle K^0 | O_2 | \bar{K}^0 \rangle = \frac{1}{3} m_K f_K^2 = 4.25 \times 10^6 MeV^3, \tag{170}$$

$$\langle K^0 | O_4 | \bar{K}^0 \rangle = \left[\frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{12} \left(\frac{m_{K^0}}{m_s(2GeV) + m_d(2GeV)} \right)^2 \right] m_K f_K^2 = 2.33 \times 10^7 MeV^3, \tag{171}$$

$$\langle B^0 | P_1 | \bar{B}^0 \rangle = \langle B^0 | P_2 | \bar{B}^0 \rangle = \frac{1}{3} m_B f_B^2 = 7.04 \times 10^7 MeV^3, \tag{172}$$

$$\langle B^0 | P_4 | \bar{B}^0 \rangle = \left[\frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{12} \left(\frac{m_{B^0}}{m_b(m_b) + m_d(m_b)} \right)^2 \right] m_B f_B^2 = 5.41 \times 10^7 MeV^3, \tag{173}$$

are used. Requiring $|(\Delta m_M)_{SUSY}| < \Delta m_M (M = K, B)$, we get

$$M_{Q,K} = m_{\phi'_{d,2}} > 0.6 TeV \quad (\Delta m_K), \tag{174}$$

$$M_{Q,K} = m_{\phi'_{d,2}} > 0.7 TeV \quad (\Delta m_B). \tag{175}$$

One finds that these constraints are weaker than Eqs. (128) and (129). Therefore three cancellation conditions Eq.(131) are reduced to two conditions Eq.(132) and Eq.(166).

6 Summary

In this paper, we have considered the Higgs-FCNC problem in $S_4 \times Z_2$ flavor symmetric extra U(1) model, and have shown that the Higgs mass bounds from FCNCs are weaken by cancellation between Higgs and SUSY contributions. As the result, SUSY breaking scale may be around $O(TeV)$ region. It might be expected that the new gauge symmetry and the flavor symmetry are tested in LHC or future colliders.

Acknowledgments

H.O. thanks great hospitality of the Kanazawa Institute for Theoretical Physics at Kanazawa University. Discussions during my visit were fruitful to finalize this project. H. O. acknowledges partial support from the Science and Technology Development Fund (STDF) project ID 437 and the ICTP project ID 30.

Appendix

A Experimental Values

Running masses of quarks and charged leptons [15]:

$$\begin{array}{lll} m_u(m_Z) = 1.28^{+0.50}_{-0.39}(\mathrm{MeV}), & m_c(m_Z) = 624 \pm 83 \ (\mathrm{MeV}), & m_t(m_Z) = 172.5 \pm 3.0(\mathrm{GeV}), \\ m_d(m_Z) = 2.91^{+1.24}_{-1.20} \ (\mathrm{MeV}), & m_s(m_Z) = 55^{+16}_{-15} \ (\mathrm{MeV}), & m_b(m_Z) = 2.89 \pm 0.09 \ (\mathrm{GeV}), \\ m_e(m_Z) = 0.48657 \ (\mathrm{MeV}), & m_\mu(m_Z) = 102.72 \ (\mathrm{MeV}), & m_\tau(m_Z) = 1746 \ (\mathrm{MeV}). \end{array} \tag{176}$$

CKM matrix elements and Jarlskog invariant [16]:

$$\begin{array}{lll} |V_{ud}| = 0.97418 \pm 0.00027, & |V_{us}| = 0.2255 \pm 0.0019, & |V_{ub}| = (3.93 \pm 0.36) \times 10^{-3}, \\ |V_{cd}| = 0.230 \pm 0.011, & |V_{cs}| = 1.04 \pm 0.06, & |V_{cb}| = (41.2 \pm 1.1) \times 10^{-3}, \\ |V_{td}| = (8.1 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-3}, & |V_{ts}| = (38.7 \pm 2.3) \times 10^{-3}, & |V_{tb}| > 0.74, \end{array}$$
$$J_{CP} = Im(V_{ud} V_{ub}^* V_{cd} V_{cb}^*) = (3.05^{+0.19}_{-0.20}) \times 10^{-5}. \tag{177}$$

Neutrino mass-squared differences and the parameters of MNS matrix [16]:

$$\Delta m_{21}^2 = m_{\nu_2}^2 - m_{\nu_1}^2 = (8.0 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-5} \quad (eV^2), \quad \Delta m_{32}^2 = \left| m_{\nu_3}^2 - m_{\nu_2}^2 \right| = (1.9 - 3.0) \times 10^{-3} \quad (eV^2),$$
$$V_{MNS} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{12} c_{13} & s_{12} c_{13} & s_{13} e^{-i\delta'} \\ -s_{12} c_{23} - c_{12} s_{23} s_{13} e^{i\delta'} & c_{12} c_{23} - s_{12} s_{23} s_{13} e^{i\delta'} & s_{23} c_{13} \\ s_{12} s_{23} - c_{12} c_{23} s_{13} e^{i\delta'} & -c_{12} s_{23} - s_{12} c_{23} s_{13} e^{i\delta'} & c_{23} c_{13} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\alpha'} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\beta'} \end{pmatrix},$$
$$\theta_{12} = 34.0^\circ{}^{+1.3^\circ}_{-1.5^\circ}, \quad 45.0^\circ > \theta_{23} > 36.8^\circ, \quad 12.9^\circ > \theta_{13} > 0.0^\circ. \tag{178}$$

Meson masses [16]:

$$m_{K^0} = 497.614 \pm 0.024 MeV, \quad m_{B^0} = 5279.50 \pm 0.30 MeV, \quad m_{D^0} = 1864.84 \pm 0.17 MeV. \tag{179}$$

Meson mass differences [16]:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta m_K &= (3.483 \pm 0.006) \times 10^{-12} MeV, \\ \Delta m_B &= (3.337 \pm 0.033) \times 10^{-10} MeV, \\ \Delta m_D &= (1.56 \pm 0.43) \times 10^{-11} MeV. \end{aligned} \tag{180}$$

Meson decay constants [17]:

$$f_K = 159.8 \pm 1.4 \pm 0.44 MeV, \quad f_B = 200 \pm 20 MeV, \quad f_D = 212 \pm 14 MeV. \tag{181}$$

Running quark mass [15]:

$$\begin{aligned} & m_d(2GeV) = 5.04^{+0.96}_{-1.54} MeV, \quad m_s(2GeV) = 105^{+25}_{-35} MeV, \\ & m_d(m_b) = 4.23^{+1.74}_{-1.71} MeV, \quad m_b(m_b) = 4.20 \pm 0.07 GeV, \\ & m_u(m_c) = 2.57^{+0.99}_{-0.84} MeV, \quad m_c(m_c) = 1.25 \pm 0.09 GeV. \end{aligned} \tag{182}$$

References

[1] H.P. Nilles, Phys. Rep. **110** (1984) 1.

[2] F. Zwirner, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A3** (1988) 49, J.L. Hewett and T.G. Rizzo, Phys. Rep. **183** (1989) 193.

[3] D. Suematsu and Y. Yamagishi, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A10** (1995) 4521.

[4] R. Howl and S.F. King, JHEP**0805** (2008) 008 [arXiv:0802.1909[hep-ph]].

[5] For reviews and recent advanced works, see the followings: P. O. Ludl, arXiv:0907.5587 [hep-ph]. H. Ishimori, T. Kobayashi, H. Ohki, H. Okada, Y. Shimizu and M. Tanimoto, arXiv:1003.3552 [hep-th], L. Merlo, arXiv:1004.2211 [hep-ph], W. Grimus and P. O. Ludl, arXiv:1006.0098 [hep-ph], K. S. Babu and S. Gabriel, arXiv:1006.0203 [hep-ph], P. O. Ludl, arXiv:1006.1479 [math-ph], T. J. Burrows and S. F. King, arXiv:1007.2310 [hep-ph] S. Forste, H. P. Nilles, S. Ramos-Sanchez and P. K.S. Vaudrevange, arXiv:1007.3915 [hep-ph], J. Barry and W. Rodejohann, arXiv:1007.5217 [hep-ph].

[6] S. Pakvasa and H. Sugawara, Phys. Lett. **B73** (1978) 61, E. Ma, Phys. Lett. **B632** (2006) 352 [arXiv:hep-ph/0508231], C. Hagedorn, M. Lindner and R.N. Mohapatra, JHEP**0606** (2006) 042 [arXiv:hep-ph/0602244], H. Zhang, Phys. Lett. B **655**, 132 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0612214], Y. Koide, JHEP**0708** (2007) 086 [arXiv:0705.2275 [hep-ph]], F. Bazzocchi and S. Morisi, [arXiv:0811.0345 [hep-ph]], H. Ishimori, Y. Shimizu and M. Tanimoto, Prog. Theor. Phys. **121**, 769 (2009) [arXiv:0812.5031 [hep-ph]], F. Bazzocchi, L. Merlo and S. Morisi, Nucl. Phys. B **816** (2009) 204 [arXiv:0901.2086 [hep-ph]], F. Bazzocchi, L. Merlo and S. Morisi, Phys. Rev. D **80** (2009) 053003 [arXiv:0902.2849 [hep-ph]], G. Altarelli, F. Feruglio and L. Merlo, JHEP **0905** (2009) 020 [arXiv:0903.1940 [hep-ph]], W. Grimus, L. Lavoura and P. O. Ludl, J. Phys. G **36**, 115007 (2009) [arXiv:0906.2689 [hep-ph]], G. J. Ding, Nucl. Phys. B **827**, 82 (2010) [arXiv:0909.2210 [hep-ph]], B. Dutta, Y. Mimura and R. N. Mohapatra, arXiv:0911.2242 [hep-ph], D. Meloni, J. Phys. G **37**, 055201 (2010) [arXiv:0911.3591 [hep-ph]], G. J. Ding and J. F. Liu, JHEP **1005**, 029 (2010) [arXiv:0911.4799 [hep-ph]], S. Morisi and E. Peinado, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 085015 (2010) [arXiv:1001.2265 [hep-ph]], C. Hagedorn, S. F. King and C. Luhn, JHEP **1006**, 048 (2010) [arXiv:1003.4249 [hep-ph]], Y. H. Ahn, S. K. Kang, C. S. Kim and T. P. Nguyen, arXiv:1004.3469 [hep-ph], H. Ishimori, K. Saga, Y. Shimizu and M. Tanimoto, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 115009 (2010) [arXiv:1004.5004 [hep-ph]], R. N. Mohapatra, arXiv:1007.1633 [hep-ph], P. V. Dong, H. N. Long, D. V. Soa and V. V. Vien, arXiv:1009.2328 [hep-ph].

[7] E.Ma and G.Rajasekaran, Phys. Rev. **D64** (2001) 113012 [arXiv:hep-ph/0106291], K.S. Babu, E. Ma and J.W.F. Valle, Phys. Lett. **B552** (2003) 207 [arXiv:hep-ph/0206292], G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, Nucl. Phys. **B741** (2006) 215 [arXiv:hep-ph/0512103], X.G. He, Y.Y. Keum and R.R. Volkas, JHEP**0604** (2006) 039 [arXiv:hep-ph/0601001], M. Honda and M. Tanimoto, Prog. Theor. Phys. **119** (2008) 583 [arXiv:0801.0181 [hep-ph]].

[8] A. Aranda, C.D. Carone and R.F. Lebed, Phys. Rev. **D62** (2000) 016009 [arXiv:hep-ph/0002044], P.H. Frampton and T.W. Kephart, JHEP**0709** (2007) 110 [arXiv:0706.1186 [hep-ph]], S. Sen, Phys. Rev. **D76** (2007) 115020 [arXiv:0710.2734 [hep-ph]], G.J. Ding, Phys. Rev. **D78** (2008) 036011 [arXiv:0803.2278 [hep-ph]], M.C. Chen, K.T. Mahanthappa and F. Yu, arXiv:0907.3963 [hep-ph], F. Feruglio, C. Hagedorn, Y. Lin and L. Merlo, Nucl. Phys. B **775** (2007) 120 [arXiv:hep-ph/0702194].

[9] I.de Medeiros Varzielas, S.F. King and G.G. Ross, Phys. Lett. **B648** (2007) 201 [arXiv:hep-ph/0607045], E. Ma, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A21** (2006) 1917 [arXiv:hep-ph/0607056], E. Ma, Phys. Lett. B **660**, 505 (2008) [arXiv:0709.0507 [hep-ph]].

[10] H. Ishimori, T. Kobayashi, H. Okada, Y. Shimizu and M. Tanimoto, JHEP **0904** (2009) 011 [arXiv:0811.4683 [hep-ph]], H. Ishimori, T. Kobayashi, H. Okada, Y. Shimizu and M. Tanimoto, JHEP **0912**, 054 (2009) [arXiv:0907.2006 [hep-ph]].

[11] Y. Daikoku and H. Okada, [arXiv:0910.3370](accepted for publication in PRD).

[12] B. A. Campbell, J. Ellis, K. Enqvist, M. K. Gaillard and D. V. Nanopoulos, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A2** (1987) 831

[13] J. Kubo, Phys. Lett. **B578** (2004) 156.

[14] F. Gabbiani, E. Gabrielli, A. Masiero and L. Silvestrini, Nucl. Phys. **B477** (1996) 321.

[15] Z. z. Xing, H. Zhang and S. Zhou, Phys. Rev. **D77** (2008) 113016 [arXiv:0712.1419[hep-ph]].

[16] C. Amsler et al. (Particle Data Group), Phys. Lett. B667, 1 (2008) and 2009 partial update for the 2010 edition. Cut-off date for this update was January 15, 2009.

[17] V. Lubicz and C. Tarantino, Nouvo Cim. **123B**(2008)674 [arXiv: 0807.4605[hep-lat]].